THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) Direct recruitment of Assistant Engineers had been suspended from 1. 4. 1972. Prior to this Assistant Executive Engineers and Assistant Engineers had been appointed on the basis of the combined Engineering Services Examination conducted by the Union Public Service Commission.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Reasons for disparity in the Promotion prospects of the two categories are (i) Assistant Executive Engineers are recruited in the grade of Group 'A' service and Assistant Engineers^in the grade of Group 'B (ii) 8he cadre of Assistant Executive Engineers is only on the basis of Combined Engineering Services Examination whereas the cadre of Assistant Engineers consists of officers by direct recruitment and also by promotion of Junior Engineers; (iii) the number of officers in the cadre of AEEs being smaller than those in the cadre of AEs as compared to the quotas which have been in operation from time to time, the officers in the AEE cadre due to their seniority are promoted at a faster rate as compared to those in the AE cadre.

As Group 'A' and Group 'B' services are not similarly placed at the time of recruitment, it would not be pos-sib'e t_0 wipe out the disparity in the promotion prospects.

Harassment of Class IV Employees of Directorate of Delhi Doordarshan

1025. SHRI GHUFRAN AZAM: Will the Mtniste$_r$ $_0$f URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it i$_s$ a fact that the Directorate of Estates served some notices to the Directorate of Delhi Doordarshan, Mandi House, New Delhi in August 1989, December, 1989 and March, 1990 in respect of pay ment of Rs. 2300|- as over stay charges by the class IV em ployees of the said Directorate where as no such allotment was made to any of the employees; if so, the reasons **thereof;**

(b) whether it is a fact that the D. G. Doordarshan has written many a times to the Directorate of Estates on (a) above but no action was taken there on; if so, the reasons therefor; and

Y

(c) whether it is also a fact that the Directorate of Estates again served a notice in the month of October * and November, 1990 without any signature to the Assistant Director, Delhi Doordarshan with a copy to one of its employees if so, the reasons therefor " and what action is being contemplated against the erring officials?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) to (c) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of th$_e$ Sabha. Refusal of Government

Accommodation to Allottee on Account of No-Payment of overstay dues by their Parents

1026. SHRI GHUFRAN AZAM: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether possession of Govern ment accommodation allotted under appropriate rules t_0 the wards of re tired Government employees is refus ed on the ground of non-payment of charges for overstay in the Govern ment accommodation allotted to their parents; and

(b) if so, in how many cases such possession was refused and in how many cases possession was handed over before clearance of overstayal dues by their parents during June, 1989; and the reason for discrimina tion in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) The concession of ad-hoc allotment/regularisation to the ward of a retired Government servant is given subject to the condition that there are ^{no} outstanding dues in the case.

(b) No separate statistics are maintained.